



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,631	05/18/2001	Maurice Chazalet	P/3610-12	4668

2352 7590 04/28/2003

OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

HUI, SAN MING R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617
DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/787,631 San-ming Hui	CHAZALET ET AL. Art Unit 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7 and 11-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7 and 11-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>19</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 19, 2003 has been entered.

Applicant's amendments filed December 27, 2002 have been entered. The addition of claim 22 is acknowledged. The cancellation of claims 1-6 is acknowledged.

Claims 7 and 11-22 are pending.

The outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is withdrawn in view of the amendments filed December 27, 2002. The outstanding rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph are withdrawn in view of the amendments filed December 27, 2002.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 11-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Dependent claims should depend from their preceding claim(s) only (See MPEP 608.01(n)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latorse (WO96/03044 provided by the applicants in Paper 5 received May 17, 2001), Shibata et al. (EP 0775 696 A1 provided by the applicants in Paper 5 received May 17, 2001), and Seitz et al. (EP 0472 996 A1 provided by the applicant in Paper 5 received May 17, 2001) in view of Budavari (Merck Index, 11th ed., 1989, monograph 4964, page 803), references of record in the previous office action mailed February 20, 2002.

Latorse teaches a composition and a method employing 2-imidazoline-5-one compounds including (4-S)-4-methyl-2-methylthio-4-phenyl-1-phenylamino-2-imidazoline-5-one useful as a fungicidal treatment for vegetables (See particularly the abstract, page 1, line 1 – page 3, line 21; also page 12, examples PM1 – PM5; page 17, example 1- page 31, example 28; also claims 1-14). Latorse also teaches the dosage of the 2-imidazoline-5-one compounds to be 10 to 5000g/ha (See claim 14).

Shibata et al. teaches a composition and a method employing valinamide-derivative compounds including N¹-[(R)-1-(6-fluoro-2-benzothiazoly)ether]-N²-isopropoxy-carbonyl-L-valinamide useful as a fungicidal treatment for crops (See

particularly abstract, page 3, line 22 – page 5, line 57; also compound No. 4 in page 18, first paragraph; page 21- page 28, examples 1-4). Shibata et al. also teaches the effective amount of the actives to be 0.1 to 5000g to treat 10 areas in liquid formulation (See page 20, line 28-36). Shibata et al. also teaches that the active compounds may be formulated into wettable powder, emulsified liquids, or granules and that the active can be sprayed on the vegetables (see page 20, line 49 – page 21, line11: formulation Examples 1-4; also page 21, example 1).

Seitz et al. teaches a valinamide-derivatives including isopropyl[2-methyl-1-(1-phenylethylcarbamoyl)-propyl]carbamte useful to be a fungicidal compound (see particularly abstract, page 8, compound 3 and page 9, compound 13).

The references do not expressly teach the combination of the 2-imidazoline-5-one compounds and valinamide-derivative compounds together in a composition and method of fungicidal application. The references do not expressly teach employment of an additional fungicidal compound, iprodione, in the composition. The references do not expressly teach the ratio between the two active compounds. The references do not expressly teach dose of the two active compounds to be 10 to 500g/ha or 20 to 300g/ha.

Budavari teaches that iprodione is useful as fungicide (See page 803, col. 2, Use Section).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the 2-imidazoline-5-one compounds and valinamide-

derivative compounds, and/or iprodione together with a dosage herein and ratio herein to form a fungicidal composition.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the combination fungicidal composition herein in a method to control the phytopathogenic fungi of crops.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the 2-imidazoline-5-one compounds and valinamide-derivative compounds, and/or iprodione together with a dosage herein and ratio herein to form a fungicidal composition because combining two or more agents which are known to be useful to be a fungicide individually into a single composition useful for the very same purpose is *prima facie* obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069. Please note that in the instant case, 2-imidazoline-5-one compounds, valinamide-derivative compounds, and iprodione are known to be useful as fungicides individually. Therefore, they are expected to be useful together in a single fungicidal composition or method, at least additive effect would be expected. Furthermore, The optimization of result effect parameters (dosage range, ratio of the active components) is obvious as being within the skill of the artisan.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the combination fungicidal composition herein in a method to control the phytopathogenic fungi of crops because the individual compounds are known to be useful in method of fungicidal application in plants or crops. Therefore combining these components together would have been reasonably expected to be useful in a method of doing the same. At least additive efficacy is expected. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069

Applicant's rebuttal arguments averring the presence of unexpected results have been considered, but are not found persuasive. Evidence as to unexpected benefits must be "clear and convincing" *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1963), and be of a scope reasonably commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed, *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972). The data provided by Applicants does not clearly and convincingly demonstrate synergism for any combination within the claims and is not reasonably commensurate in scope with the instant claims. For example, examples 1 to 4 in page 31 to 38 in the specification relate only to certain fungal species and the employment of 3 compounds herein claimed useful in a fungicidal combination in accordance with the claims (i.e., compound A, B, and C in the specification). A supraadditive effect for the combinations of individual agents herein, based on raw data on the same individual agents in comparison to their corresponding combination, is not present. It is not clear what the practical efficacy of compound A and that of compound B are, and therefore, it is not possible to evaluate what the theoretical efficacy, according to Colby's formula, will be. Moreover, the unexpected results have to be commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed. In the instant case, claim recites the ratio between compound A and compound B as the range from 5 to 0.5, while the examples 1-4 in the instant specification merely demonstrate the ratio of 1:1 to 1:4. In addition, it is not clear why the theoretical efficacy formula disclosed in page 32, line 18, for example, as $\%TE(A+B) = \%PE(A) + \underline{\%TE(B)} - (\%PE(A) \times \%PE(B)/100)$. Should $\%TE(A+B)$ be equal to $\%PE(A) + \underline{\%PE(B)} - (\%PE(A) \times \%PE(B)/100)$ instead?

(See Colby, provided by the applicant in the IDS filed March 11, 2003). Therefore, no clear and convincing unexpected results are seen herein.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.



San-ming Hui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1617
April 25, 2003